

REMARKS

Applicants have carefully studied the outstanding Office Action. The present amendment is intended to place the application in condition for allowance and is believed to overcome all of the objections and rejections made by the Examiner. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Claims **38 – 57** are presented for examination.

In paragraphs 3 - 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims **38 – 57** under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Ng, U.S. Patent No. 6,640,301 ("Ng").

Brief Discussion of Prior Art

Ng describes a web service for authenticating e-mail messages and verifying that the messages are genuine (Ng/ col. 13, lines 57 - 59). For each e-mail message, the web service generates a corresponding message ID, which is inserted into the e-mail message, and also used to index a secure table that stores a checksum corresponding to the e-mail message. When the e-mail message is subsequently presented for authentication, a checksum derived from the e-mail message is compared with the checksum stored in the table to verify that the e-mail message has not been modified (Ng/ col. 4, lines 15 - 47; col. 6, line 59 - col. 7, line 15; col. 7, lines 22 - 48; col. 8, lines 30 - 42; col. 9, lines 1 - 28; FIGS. 6 and 7).

Response to Examiner's Arguments

Applicants have reviewed the cited reference of Ng in its entirety. The rejections of claims **38 – 57** in paragraphs 3 - 5 of the Office Action will now be dealt with specifically.

1. Ng does not disclose embedding a unique identifier and a check sum for authenticating the unique identifier within an electronic document

In rejecting claim **38** in page 2 of the Office Action (and in rejecting claim **48** on page 4 of the Office Action based on the rejection of claim **38**), the Examiner has indicated that Ng discloses embedding a unique identifier and a check sum for authenticating the unique identifier within a static section of an electronic document. The Examiner has further indicated on page 3 of the Office Action, with reference to FIGS. 4 and 6 of Ng, that CKSUM KEYS and PAD are stored within the e-mail message body.

Applicants respectfully submit that Ng does not store the checksum in the e-mail message body, but instead stores the check sum in a secure storage on a web server (element 30 of FIGS. 4 – 7, 12 and 13). Indeed, Ng recites:

The checksum and the pad characters are stored in a table indexed by the message ID. The pad characters and the checksum are placed in secure storage and are not available to users or others on the Internet. The email with the message ID in the markers but without the pad characters or checksum is sent to the recipients. (Ng/ Abstract; emphasis added)

The checksum from the checksum generator is written to the table ... (Ng/ col. 4, lines 26 and 27)

Authentication service 28 then generates a checksum of the message and stores the checksum ... in secure storage 30. (Ng/ col. 6, lines 63 – 66)

A checksum ... is generate [sic] for the email message and stored in checksum field 34 ... (Ng/ col. 7, lines 33 – 35)

The checksum V from checksum generator 40 is stored in secure storage 30 ... (Ng/ col. 8, lines 54 and 55)

The new checksum V and the pad characters K are stored in the table ... (Ng/ col. 11, lines 43 and 44)

The checksum and the extra variable are stored at a secure third-party web site so that the checksum and the extra variable are not available to the sender or recipient. The checksum and the extra variable are stored at a third-party web site ... (Ng/ col. 13, lines 35 – 40)

... wherein the checksum from the checksum generator is written to the table ... (Ng/ claim 1)

Moreover, Ng makes it clear that storing the checksum within the e-mail message body would defeat the purpose of authentication (Ng/ col. 6, lines 21 – 29; col. 13, lines 33 – 40).

2. Ng does not disclose embedding a control mark within a static section of an electronic document, wherein the control mark remains unchanged when the document is edited.

In rejecting claim **38** on page 2 of the Office Action (and in rejecting claim **48** on page 4 of the Office Action based on the rejection of claim **38**), the Examiner has indicated that Ng discloses that the control mark remains unchanged when the electronic document is edited.

Applicants respectfully submit that the message ID embedded into an e-mail message by Ng is editable plaintext that may be changed at will, as clearly shown in FIGS. 8A – 8D, 9A – 9C and 11 of Ng. Of course, the changed text will fail authentication by Ng's authentication service, but nevertheless the embedded message ID is easily modified by

a user who receives the e-mail message. Moreover, Ng acknowledges that verification results are forgeable. Specifically Ng recites:

Optionally, the returned email is again certified to protect the results of verification, and to prevent forgery of verification results. (Ng/ col. 7, lines 15 – 17)

3. Ng does not disclose monitoring network packets.

In rejecting claim **38** on page 3 of the Office Action (and in rejecting claim **48** on page 4 of the Office Action based on the rejection of claim **38**), the Examiner has indicated that Ng discloses monitoring network packets.

Applicants respectfully submit that the service and method of Ng apply to e-mail messages, but do not operate on the level of network packets. The only mention of a packet in Ng appears at col. 2, lines 56 regarding text typed by a user into an input box. Moreover, on page 2 of the Examiner's restriction requirement of September 1, 2009, the Examiner specifically indicates that monitoring e-mail messages and monitoring network packets are patentably distinct inventions, as a result of which applicants withdrew claims **1 – 36**.

4. Ng does not disclose limiting access of an electronic document to authorized recipients.

In rejecting claim **38** on page 3 of the Office Action (and in rejecting claim **48** on page 4 of the Office Action based on the rejection of claim **38**), the Examiner has indicated that Ng discloses monitoring transmitted network packets in order to limit access of an electronic documents to authorized recipients.

Applicants respectfully submit that Ng relates to authentication, and not to access control. At col. 13, lines 57 – 59, Ng recites:

... the authentication service proves that a message is genuine, unaltered, not tampered with, and unmodified.

The message verification of Ng, cited by the Examiner with reference to FIG. 7 of Ng, is used to verify that a message has not been altered, and not to limit access of the message.

CONCLUSION

The undersigned representative respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance, and such disposition is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that the prosecution might be advanced by discussing the application with the undersigned representative, in person or over the telephone, we welcome the opportunity to do so. In addition, if any additional fees are required in connection with the filing of this response, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the same to Deposit Account No. 504402.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 5, 2010
KING & SPALDING LLP
1700 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20006-4706
(202) 737-0500

By: /Eric L. Sophir, Reg. #48,499/
Eric L. Sophir
Registration No. 48,499